United Nations E/2002/71 (Part II)

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
3 July 2002
English
Original: English/Spanish

Substantive session of 2002
New York, 1-26 July 2002
Item 12 of the provisional agenda
Non-governmental organizations

Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2002 regular session

New York, 13-24, 29 and 30 May 2002

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
	Part one*		
I.	Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council		
	Draft decision I Application for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations		
	Draft decision II Quadrennial reports, special reports and complaints		
	Draft decision III Resumed 2002 session		
	Draft decision IV Establishment of the general voluntary trust fund in support of the United Nations NGO Informal Regional Network		
	Draft decision V Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2002 regular session		
	Part two		
II.	Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat	2–14	3

* Part one of the report is issued separately in document E/2002/71 (Part I).

02-45991 (E) 211102 061202

III.	Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification	15–60	5
	A. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions of the Committee	15–49	5
	1. Applications for consultative status	16–48	5
	2. Requests for reclassification	49	14
	B. New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification	50–60	15
	1. Applications for consultative status	51–58	15
	2. Requests for reclassification	59–60	20
IV.	Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304	61–75	21
	A. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31	61–70	21
	B. Consideration of issues on the agenda of the informal working group	71–72	22
	C. Other matters	73–75	23
V.	Implementation of Council decision 1996/302	76–77	24
VI.	Review of deferred quadrennial reports	78–82	24
VII.	Consideration of special reports and complaints submitted by Member States	83–135	26
	A. Special reports	84-116	26
	B. Complaints by States	117–135	37
VIII.	Organization of the session	136–145	41
	A. Opening and duration of the session	136	41
	B. Attendance	137	41
	C. Election of officers	138–139	41
	D. Agenda	140–141	41
	E. Resumed 2002 session of the Committee	142–143	42
	F. Documentation	144	43
IX.	Adoption of the report of the Committee on its 2002 session	145	43
Annexes			
I.	Conference-servicing implications of convening a resumed session of the Committee in January 2003		44
II.	List of participants		45
III.	List of documents		47

Part two

II. Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat

2. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations considered agenda item 3 at its 11th and 21st meetings, on 20 and 29 May.

3. Reporting to the Committee, the Chief of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section, Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, presented the work accomplished over the year, underlining that although the Section had achieved progress and improvement in its methods of work, many tasks on its agenda remained to be implemented.

4. The Chief of the Section presented before the Committee the various tasks implemented by the Section as requested by the mandate of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31. In particular, she reviewed the initiatives and recommendations implemented since 1999. She listed the new initiatives in progress and put forward a number of recommendations and programmes for future action.

5. Recalling that the Section was the secretariat of the Committee, she emphasized the important role of the Section to enhance opportunities for dialogue among the various partners of civil society and to increase the Committee's capacity to serve as a focal point for interaction between the non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Council and the United Nations at large.

6. In reviewing the achievements accomplished over the past three years by the Section, she referred to the various new initiatives developed by the Section to reach civil society, in particular NGOs. In that regard, she referred to the report of the United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services (E/AC.51/2002/4), which had credited the effectiveness of the outreach programme launched by the Section, noting that a more balanced geographical representation of NGOs had been working in partnership with the United Nations over the past five years. The outreach programme was strongly supported by the enhanced dissemination of information through the use by the Section of brochures, guidelines and workshops, and through a daily updated web site, now available in English and French, to facilitate both the accreditation process and the submission of applications and reports by the NGOs. She recalled that the Global Informal Regional Network, launched in 2001, had been established, with designated regional coordinating organizations, and plans had been made to initiate the necessary linkages and programmes to establish viable and effective interregional networks. The informal network's regional-level activities had been inaugurated in Tunisia at the beginning of the year, to be followed by another regional programme opening in Eastern Europe at the end of 2002 and two others in the Asia and the Pacific region and the Latin America and the Caribbean region.

7. In addition, the Chief of the Section pointed out that the Section continued to support NGO activities in the deliberations of the Council. Since 1999, it had assisted several NGOs in their participation in the Council's high-level and general segments. In 2002, NGOs had been invited to participate in other Council activities as well as round tables at the ministerial level.

8. However, the Chief of Section noted that a number of issues were pending or in progress, especially the collaboration of the Section with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) on the project described in the previous report on the work of the Section (see A/50/520), which had not been implemented due to the serious understaffing of the Section. Similarly, she stressed the need to monitor and follow up NGOs in Roster status that were not under the obligation to submit reports. More substantially, she underlined the usefulness of completing the compilation of a fully cross-referenced inventory, detailing the expertise available from NGOs in consultative status with the Council, and of establishing informational profiles of such NGOs by type, by category of consultative status, by primary activities and by geographical regions. Most importantly, the Section had established special mechanisms to strengthen the coordination between the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, the Section and the Committee, following the numerous complaints against NGOs referred by Member States to the attention of the Committee for action.

9. With respect to the future, she noted that the necessary strengthening of the Section had been made obvious by the increasing list of crucial responsibilities facing the Section, such as the exponentially increasing number of decisions deferred by the Committee and the fast-growing backlog of incoming applications. The understaffed Section, faced with the rapidly increasing number of tasks assigned to it, had been able to execute them by extending working hours beyond the normal standard and by the use of short-term assistance, but such ad hoc arrangements had inevitably resulted in discontinuities and loss of accumulated experience and institutional memory.

10. All the speakers who commented on the report of the Chief expressed their strong support for the Section's enhanced and continuous efforts to serve the Committee and the NGO community. As evidence of the support of the Section for its outreach programme, the delegate of the Sudan introduced a draft decision requesting the establishment of a voluntary trust fund to support the informal regional network IRENE in assisting NGOs worldwide with equally distributed financial support; the decision was subsequently adopted by the Committee (see part one, sect. I, draft decision IV). Along with other representatives from Africa, she hoped that the network would improve the representation of NGOs from Africa who were currently underrepresented.

11. The majority of the delegations supported the intervention of the French representative, who, in addition to supporting strongly the initiatives and efforts of the NGO Section, deplored its anomalous staffing situation. In particular, he regretted that the establishment of a P-5 post in the Section, requested by the Committee at each session since 1999, had not yet been implemented. He recalled that, at the last resumed session of the Committee, the Committee had taken the position that, in the event that no action had been taken on this issue before the 2002 session, the adequate strengthening of the Section should be the object of a resolution that the Committee should bring up at its 2002 resumed session.

12. The representative of Tunisia, noting that the Section had benefited from the assistance of an interregional adviser from the Department of Economic and Social Affairs to organize the meeting in Tunisia, hoped that that assistance could be extended to strengthen the network in order to support the subregional and regional NGO coordinators and to launch the network in other regions.

13. At the 21st meeting, on 29 May 2002, the Chief of the Executive Office and the Chief of the Budget Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs came before the Committee to answer the questions posed by its members regarding the functioning, mechanisms and modalities of a general voluntary trust fund established by the Secretary-General. The Chief of the Executive Office explained that such funds, consistent with the overall goals of the United Nations, were managed by the Controller of the Organization and had been subject to rules and procedures of the Organization administering those funds. Similarly, she added that the cost plan of the fund presented by the Department concerned was also reviewed by the Controller, and no disbursement of funds could be authorized without the Controller's approval. She pointed out that any donor could contribute to the Fund; however, those contributions were subjected to the Controller's acceptance. Donors could, if they so wished, earmark their financial contribution to the Fund for specific activities; however, those activities should be compatible with the terms of reference of the Fund.

14. The Chief of the Section concluded that new priorities arising from recent mandates contained in the United Nations Millennium Declaration needed to be looked at. Enhancing the role and performance of NGOs would contribute to the implementation of the millennium development goals.

III. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification

A. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions of the Committee

15. The Committee considered item 4 (a) of its agenda at its 3rd to 8th, 16th and 18th to 24th meetings, on 14 to 16, 18 to 24, 29 and 30 May 2002. It had before it compilations of applications for consultative status (E/C.2/2002/CRP.1) and requests for reclassification (E/C.2/2002/CRP.3) deferred from previous sessions.

1. Applications for consultative status

16. The Committee recommended that consultative status be granted to the following organizations whose applications had been deferred from previous sessions (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (a)):

General consultative status

National Association of Non-Governmental Organizations

Special consultative status

A Woman's Voice International

Africa Infrastructures Foundation

American Society of Safety Engineers

Antioch Christian Centre

Association internationale de lutte contre la pauvreté et pour le développement

Association mauritanienne pour le bien-être et le secours de l'enfant et de la mère

Association marocaine de planification familiale

Becket Fund for Religious Liberty

Canada Family Action Coalition

Canadian Race Relations Foundation

Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action

Centre féminin pour la promotion du développement

Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples

Drug Watch International

Ethiopian World Federation

Federation of Women Lawyers in Kenya

Global Housing Foundation

Hope for Africa

Indonesian National Council on Social Welfare

International Environmental Law Research Centre

International Federation of Inspection Agencies

International Fund For Animal Welfare

International Movement for Leisure Activities in Science and Technology

International Possibilities Unlimited

Kitakyushu Forum on Asian Women

Korea International Volunteer Organization

Medico International

Netherlands Centre for Indigenous Peoples

Physicians for Social Responsibility

Pro Dignitate Foundation for Human Rights

Rainforest Foundation

Society of Automotive Engineers

Sovereign Military Order of the Temple of Jerusalem

Swedish Organization of Disabled Persons International Aid Association

United Nations Watch

United World Colleges

Roster

Association of American Railroads

Confederation of European Forest Owners

Confederation of German Forest Owners Associations

European Association of Automotive Suppliers

Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights

Motorcycle Riders Foundation

National Council of the Saemaul-Undong Movement

Rethinking Tourism Project

UNESCO Centre Basque Country

UNESCO Centre of Catalonia

United Nations Watch

17. At its 2000 and 2001 sessions, the Committee had deferred the application of United Nations Watch, and had posed questions concerning its finances and the high cost of its administration.

18. At its 8th meeting, on 16 May 2002, the Committee took up consideration of the organization's application. Some members of the Committee and some observer delegations raised several new questions. The organization was asked to explain in what instances it criticized the position taken by the United Nations and whether the organization's main objective was focusing on the treatment of Israel in the United Nations. Other questions referred to the position taken by the organization against the convening of the Conference of High Contracting Parties of the Fourth Geneva Convention. The autonomy of the organization was also questioned and its relationship with the American Jewish Committee. In addition, it was asked to express its views on whether there was an Arab and Muslim anti-Semitic lobby in the United Nations. A representative of United Nations Watch who was present in the meeting room was invited to the podium to respond to the questions posed to the organization. Due to the lack of remaining time at the meeting, a decision on the NGO was left pending. Some members and observer delegations handed in written questions to the Secretariat for the organization.

19. At its 19th meeting, on 24 May 2002, the Committee again took up the application of the organization. A written response from United Nations Watch was distributed to the Committee members. The representative of Lebanon expressed his dissatisfaction with the replies, which he found to be vague. He believed that if the American Jewish Committee (AJC) had two seats on the Board of the organization and the current Chairman of the Board of the organization was also the President of AJC, the organization's autonomous character was doubtful. He said that David Harris, Executive Director of AJC, who was also Co-Chair of United Nations Watch, had made several comments that were insulting to the Arab and Muslim world. He was convinced that the organization was prejudiced against Arabs and Muslims and that its main activity remained to defend one Member State, namely Israel, from alleged discrimination by other United Nations Member States. In addition, he referred to several comments made by the organization criticizing the United

Nations. He asserted that several clear questions posed to the organization, requiring a yes or no answer, had remained deliberately unanswered. A lot of crucial basic information was deliberately withheld by the NGO and had not been included in its application for members to take note of, including information concerning its close ties with AJC, inter alia, through David Harris. Not only was Mr. Harris Co-Chair of the NGO and Executive Director of AJC but also the NGO's Chairman, Alfred Moses, was also President of AJC. And notwithstanding the NGO's pro-Israeli and anti-Arab stance, its deliberate withholding of information regarding its positions and close ties to other controversial NGOs that offended a large number of United Nations Member States meant that granting status to the NGO, as a matter of principle, would undermine the credibility of the Committee. To conclude, he proposed that the Committee recommend that consultative status not be granted to the organization.

20. The delegations of Senegal, Pakistan, the Sudan, Tunisia, Cuba and China, in their statements, echoed the views of Lebanon, and maintained that the organization's answers were evasive and that it was not completely honest with members. They also expressed their concerns at the organization's stance and actions, particularly to the organization's answer to question 11, in which it had stated that the organization would not be called upon to adhere to decisions and resolutions adopted by various United Nations bodies. Those resolutions and decisions, they asserted, were applicable to all States, and the organization, by refusing to adhere to them, had violated the principles of the United Nations Charter and the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31, which guided the work of the Committee. The delegations of Senegal and Tunisia expressed their dissatisfaction at the organization's replies on the issue of the Fourth Geneva Convention and on the international day of solidarity with the Palestinian people.

21. The delegations of Germany and Chile supported the work of the organization and believed that it could greatly contribute to the work of the Council. They were of the view that affiliation of the organization to AJC did not constitute a reason for not recommending consultative status to it. They also thought that criticizing the United Nations did not mean being against the United Nations as such.

22. The representative of France stated that the affiliation of the organization to AJC did not constitute grounds for not recommending the organization consultative status. In addition, he expressed his surprise that all the 15 questions posed to the organization were directly related to the issue of Palestine, the Middle East and AJC only. The organization had interests in that area as well as in other areas. An organization should not be denied consultative status with the Council because of its specialization.

23. The representative of the United States associated himself with the statements of France and Germany. He expressed his inability to understand why the organization could not be granted status because one of its members, Mr. Harris, was on two boards. He stated that organizations were entitled to exercise their freedom of speech. As far as the organization's relationship with the United Nations was concerned, he had read several excerpts of letters signed by Kofi Annan, Secretary-General of the United Nations, showing appreciation for the work done by the organization.

24. Concluding the discussion, the representative of the United States proposed suspension of the meeting in order to conduct informal consultations. The

representative of Lebanon opposed the move by saying that action on the case has been long overdue and should be taken immediately. The Committee, by a roll-call vote of 7 to 7, with 4 abstentions, rejected the proposal to suspend the meeting. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Romania, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia.

Abstentions:

India, Russia, Senegal, Turkey.

25. Subsequently, in accordance with rule 50 (Adjournment of debate) of the Council's rules of procedure, the representative of the United States asked for an adjournment of debate on the proposal made by the representative of Lebanon to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status. During the debate that ensued on the procedural motion invoked by the United States delegation, several delegations questioned the admissibility of such a motion. Replying to procedural questions, the Secretary of the Committee explained that rule 50 was also known in the proceedings of the Council bodies as a procedural motion of no action. Since a proposal had already been made by a member of the Committee, the only way for another member of the Committee to stop it was by invoking a no action motion. Once a proposal had been made, the Committee proceeded by applying rule 67 (Order of voting on proposals), paragraph 2, with the procedure described in rule 50 (Adjournment of debate). Whether a delegation invoked the no action motion by directly invoking the respective rule(s) of procedure or whether a delegation moved a no action motion against a proposal before the Committee without invoking the specific rule(s), the Chairperson would apply and follow the same established procedure known as a no action motion.

26. Following statements by the representatives of the Sudan, Pakistan, France, China and Chile on points of order, the morning meeting had to be adjourned for lunch with the understanding that the discussion would resume in the afternoon.

27. At the beginning of the 20th meeting, on 24 May, the procedural motion under rule 50 of the rules of procedure of the Council was withdrawn and the Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposal made by the representative of Lebanon to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status. The Committee, by a roll-call vote of 8 to 9, with 2 abstentions, rejected the proposal. The votes were as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia.

Against:

Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Romania, Turkey, United States.

Abstentions:

India, Russian Federation.

28. The representative of the Russian Federation made an explanation of vote before the vote. The representatives of Romania, Pakistan, France, Colombia, China, Ethiopia and the United States made explanations of vote after the vote.

29. Several delegates sought clarification regarding the status of the NGO's application after the proposal to recommend that it not be granted consultative status had been rejected. The Chairperson, having listened to the discussion on the matter, decided to proceed to another vote since there was no agreement among the members that a rejection of one proposal would automatically mean that an opposite proposal would be approved.

30. The representative of France, speaking on points of order, stated that the first vote rejecting the proposal made by Lebanon should be understood as a decision of the Committee granting consultative status to the organization. The Committee did not have to vote twice on the same issue. The fact that the vote was posed in a negative or positive way did not matter. He stated that he would agree to a second vote on the condition that the procedure would in no way constitute a precedent.

31. The representative of the United States subsequently proposed that if the rejection of the first proposal did not automatically imply granting consultative status to the organization United Nations Watch, his delegation would then make such a proposal to the Committee.

32. Following the proposal made by the United States, the representative of Lebanon moved a no-action motion against it. The United States and Chile made statements against the motion and Tunisia and Pakistan made statements in favour of the motion. The Committee, by a roll-call vote of 7 to 9, with 3 abstentions, rejected the no action motion. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia.

Against:

Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Romania, Turkey, United States of America.

Abstentions:

India, Russian Federation, Senegal.

33. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposal to recommend that the organization be granted special consultative status. The proposal was carried by a roll-call vote of 9 to 8, with 2 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Romania, Turkey, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Senegal, the Sudan, Tunisia.

Abstentions:

India, Russian Federation.

Statements of explanations of vote before the vote

34. The representative of France, explaining his vote before the vote, recalled his delegation's position as highlighted through the two points of order following the voting on the first Lebanese proposal. He emphasized that the procedure should in no way constitute a precedent.

35. The representative of Colombia underlined that the second vote would address the same issue and would have the same outcome as the first one, rejecting the proposal made by Lebanon. That procedure should not constitute a precedent.

36. The delegation of Pakistan said that, while considering an application, the Committee should take one of three actions: recommend, not recommend or defer. It was therefore clear that the rejection of the proposal to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status did not automatically mean that the Committee agreed to grant consultative status to the organization, hence there was no question of precedence.

37. The delegate of the Sudan stated that the organization had indicated very clearly that it would not adhere to the decisions and resolutions adopted by various United Nations organs, which would set a very serious precedent. An organization that at the onset was not ready to adhere to decisions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations would not adhere to Council resolution 1996/31 and the Charter of the United Nations.

Statements in explanations of vote after the vote

38. The representatives of Chile, Ethiopia and Senegal explained their vote after the vote. The delegation of France made a general statement reiterating the points made earlier. The Sudan also made a general statement pointing out that the Committee had to follow its customary practice.

National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People

39. At its 2001 session, the Committee had deferred the application of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People due to time constraints. At its 3rd meeting, on 14 May 2002, when the Committee reviewed the application of the NGO, the representative of the Sudan stated that, while appreciative of the noble cause the organization was advocating, she believed that the organization had wrongly levelled very serious accusations against her country. She further stated that the organization had issued resolutions, based on false information, condemning a United Nations Member State, and in so doing was tremendously misinformed about the situation in that country. Other delegations were of the view that the organization could not comment and condemn categorically other countries when it seemed that the organization's main activities focused on the economic and legislative rights of minorities essentially located in the United States, which was perceived as a contradiction. Several delegations supported the Sudan's viewpoint.

40. A number of delegations, including the delegation of the United States, underlined the important role of the organization in supporting and enhancing the rights of minorities in the United States. A delegation suggested that it was not unusual to have national organizations involved in international activities. The Committee deferred the application pending a response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee.

Felege Guihon International

41. At its 2000 session, the Committee did not review the application of Felege Guihon International due to time constrains. Having reviewed the file of the organization at its 2001 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of the NGO on the understanding that a number of members of the Committee would require written answers to their concerns regarding the NGO's activities.

42. At the 16th meeting, on 22 May 2002, after considering the answers given by the NGO and reviewing the background of the organization, the representative of Ethiopia called for the closing of the file, stating that the organization was a political one in nature and had no relevance to the work of the Economic and Social Council. The Committee decided to close consideration of the application of the organization by a role-call vote of 10 to none, with 8 abstentions (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (c)).

In favour:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey.

Against:

None.

Abstentions:

France, Germany, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, United States, Bolivia, Chile.

43. The representatives of Senegal, Bolivia, the United States and Chile made statements in explanation of vote, indicating that since they had not anticipated a vote they had not received instructions from their capitals and had therefore abstained.

Alliance musulmane d'Angola

44. At its 2001 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of the Alliance musulmane d'Angola pending a response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee. At its 5th meeting, on 15 May 2002, the Committee noted that the organization had not yet provided the clarifications requested by the Committee. In that regard, a delegation was of the view that a solution to the matter was to be reached in the informal working group of the Committee.

Applications deferred pending responses to questions posed by the Committee

45. Pending responses to questions posed by the Committee during its 2002 regular session, the Committee deferred the applications of the following organizations:

Africa for Christ International

African Center Foundation

American Conservative Union

Coordinating Body for the Indigenous Organizations in the Amazon Basin

Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative

International Centre for Peace Studies

Japan Civil Liberties Union

Local Government International Bureau

Non-Aligned Students and Youth Organization

Non-Violence International

World Organization for Education, Science and Development

World Organization for Education, Science and Development

46. At its 5th meeting, on 15 May 2002, the Committee debated at length on the status to be given to the organization previously registered as World Permanent Organization for Jamahiriyan Youth. A number of delegations, referring to paragraph 22 of Council resolution 1996/31, were of the view that the organization could receive general consultative status with the Council since it had a large membership and was involved in activities in several sectors. Other delegations underlined that, according to the criteria stipulated in the same paragraph, an organization needed to develop a larger number of sectors of activities in relation to the work of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, in addition to having a large membership, in order to obtain the general category usually recommended to organizations that had activities in several countries. Those delegations did not believe that it was the case of the NGO. In addition, another delegation emphasized that a change of the organization's name did not imply a change in its activities. A number of delegations also noted that the organization was the owner of several private companies and therefore, might not be a non-profit organization.

47. The Committee had ad referendum recommended that the organization be granted special status, pending response to be provided by the organization to additional questions posed by the Committee. At its 21st meeting, on 29 May, the Committee, not satisfied with the response provided by the organization, requested further clarifications and decided to defer the review of the application of the organization to its 2002 resumed session.

Applications deferred due to time constraints

48. Due to time constraints, the Committee deferred to its 2002 resumed session consideration of the applications of the following organizations:

African Community Resource Center

Amitié sans frontières internationale

Association of Expelled Persons

Community of Sant'Egidio

E-quality

Federation of IJAW Communities

Foyer musulman

Kashiri American Council

Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International

Human Rights International Alliance

Institute for Global Environmental Strategies

International Federation of Medical Students Associations

International Centre for Not-for-Profit Law

International Commission on Distance Education (CODE)

International Multimodal Transport Association

International Planned Parenthood Federation (Europe Region)

International Prostitutes Collective

International Religious Liberty Association

International Society of Human Rights

Islamic American Zakat Foundation

Jubilee Campaign

Millennium Institute

Minaret of Freedom Institute

Mountain Women Development Organization

National Abortion Federation

National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty

Population Concern

Relief International

Russian Public Movement "For Civil Rights"

University of Missouri — Kansas City Women's Council

Visha Hindu Parishad

Wales Assembly of Women

World Council for Psychotherapy

2. Requests for reclassification

International Association of Charities

49. At its 2000 and 2001 sessions, the Committee had decided to defer the application of the International Association of Charities, which had been placed on the Roster by virtue of its consultative status with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), pending the outcome of the debate of the Committee on the question of granting consultative status to non-governmental organizations placed in the Roster by virtue of their consultative status with other United Nations bodies of the specialized agencies. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not review the application (see E/C.2/2002/CRP.3) at its 2002 regular session.

B. New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification

50. The Committee considered item 4 (b) of its agenda at its 1st to 4th, 7th to 18th and 20th to 24th meetings, from 13 to 23 May and on 29 and 30 May 2002. It had before it memoranda of the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status (E/C.2/2002/R.2 and Add.1-5) and new requests for reclassification (E/C.2/2002/R.3).

1. New applications for consultative status

51. The Committee recommended that consultative status be granted to the following organizations (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (a)):

General consultative status

International Higher Education Academy of Sciences

Russian Academy of Natural Sciences

Special consultative status

American Society of Criminology

Argentine Society of Pediatrics

Asian Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Network

Assembly of First Nations-National Indian Brotherhood

Assistance pédagogue internationale

Association européenne des cheminots

Association marocaine d'aide à l'enfant et à la famille

Association pour la défense des droits de la femme et de l'enfant

Association pour la formation et l'insertion sociale de l'adolescent et de la femme

Canadian HIV/AIDS Legal Network

Center for Oceans Law and Policy

Chinese People's Association for Peace and Disarmament

CARE

Dominican Leadership Conference

Family Health International

Hawa Society for Women

Health on the Net Foundation

Hong Kong Federation of Women's Centres

Hope for the Nations

Imam Al-Sadr Foundation

Institute for Energy and Environmental Research

International AIDS Vaccine Initiative

International Association for Human Values

Interregional Union of Life Help for Mentally Handicapped Persons "Sail of Hope"

Jesuit Refugee Service

Jose Marti Cultural Society

Kiwanis International

Korea Freedom League

Lebanon Family Planning Association

Mariano y Rafael Castillo Córdova Foundation

Medical Aid for Palestinians

National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers

Open Family Australia

Roster

Alumni Association of the Willem C. Vis International Commercial Arbitration Moot

Association angolaise pour les activités sociales

Association de développement de la vallée du Dra

Association francophone internationale des directeurs d'établissements Scolaires

Centre de documentation, de recherche et d'information des peuples autochtones

Christian Blind Mission International

Femme développement entreprise en Afrique

Forests Monitor

Guinea Development Foundation

Nippon Foundation

Viva Network

52. Pending the receipt of further information in response to questions posed by the Committee, the Committee deferred to its 2002 resumed session the applications of the following organizations:

Ambedkar Centre for Justice and Peace

American Family Association of New York

Focus on the Family

Focus on the Family (Canada) Association

Global and Locus

Human Relief Foundation

International Crisis Group

World Sindhi Institute

53. Owing to time constraints, the Committee deferred to its 2002 resumed session the applications of the following organizations:

International Association of Homes and Services for the Ageing

International Islamic Committee for Woman and Child

New Seminary

Pathfinder International

RICS Foundation

Spanish Association of Jurist Women

Korean Freedom League

54. At its 22nd meeting, on 29 May 2002, the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, speaking as an observer, expressed his concern at the recommendation made by the Committee to grant consultative status to the Korea Freedom League. He made the following statement:

"Upon instructions from my capital, my delegation would like to express its observation with regard to an NGO and share updated information regarding that NGO.

"The NGO Korea Freedom League submitted to the Committee for consideration at its 2002 session a new application for consultative status with the Council (see E/C.2/2002/R.2/Add.2).

"On 14 May 2002, the Committee considered the application of the NGO and unfortunately decided to recommend that the Council grant the NGO special consultative status, which arouses serious concern on the part of my delegation.

"My delegation regrets that the recommendation of the Committee regarding this NGO resulted from a lack of awareness of the nature of this organization and its activities. Let me share some information.

"First, the Korea Freedom League is a thoroughly anti-communist political entity, which was created with the aim of politically slandering and undermining our Republic, a compatriot nation.

"Council resolution 1996/31 mentions, in part VIII, paragraph 57 (a), that NGOs that wish to attain consultative status shall refrain from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, including motivated acts against Member States of the United Nations.

"The United Nations has made it a principle among others, to respect the sovereign equality of all its members, develop friendly relations among nations

based on mutual respect and harmonize the actions of nations to achieve the common goals of humankind.

"Nevertheless, the Korea Freedom League, formerly the Korea Anti-Communism League (established on 15 June 1964), has in all its activities pursued political purposes against our Republic and made it its business to slander our system at every opportunity.

"The NGO has been engaged in viciously plotting to do harm to and threatening figures deemed leftist, assailing the democratic forces of South Korea and ostracizing politically pro-North figures, thus obtaining a reputation even in South Korea as a notorious far-rightist anti-reunification organization.

"Most recently, this NGO has been under fire after it released an official statement saying that if the 'arch-enemy' phrase, which is now under debate for deletion in South Korean society and by relevant authorities, is to be modified or deleted, security awareness will be diminished.

"As is well known, the entire Korean nation and the international community wish to eliminate the last vestige of the cold war on the Korean peninsula, to create and promote an environment conducive to reconciliation and cooperation between the North and South of Korea, and to realize Korean unification as soon as possible.

"Since the adoption on 15 June 2000 of the historic joint declaration between the North and South of Korea, a trend towards reconciliation and cooperation between the two parties has prevailed and reaffirmed itself even though there have sometimes been ups and downs because of outside intervention.

"The Korean Freedom League, which tries to reverse that trend of our times and continues to cling to anti-Democratic People's Republic of Korea activities, is evidently an anachronistic organization that seeks political trickery with anti-communist fanaticism.

"Second, the Korea Freedom League has engaged in such activities as undermining the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Member States of the United Nations.

"This NGO, whose first inception was the Asian Anti-Communism League established in 1954, had close relations with Chang Kai Sek of Taiwan and engaged in sinister political activities against the People's Republic of China and my country.

"In 1967, this NGO hosted in Taiwan a meeting of anti-communist organizations, and continued in the 1970s and in 1984 to be engaged in endeavours to undermine political stability vis-à-vis our Republic and other peaceful countries in Asia.

"The official web site of the organization insists on naming Taiwan, which is an integral part of the People's Republic of China, as the 'Republic of China'.

"Third, the application of this NGO, which was submitted to the Committee in English, does not conform to its real purpose and activities as described in Korean.

"The information in the Korean version of this NGO shows that it imbues among society the concept of 'reunification by victory over communism', creates enmity instead of amity against compatriots of the North, and inspires the concepts of realizing reunification by absorbing the North or by victory of one system over the other.

"Nothing can be changed in its substantial character and activities, even though the application of the NGO appeared to have been prepared smoothly, using appropriate United Nations phrases.

"If such an organization is to be granted consultative status with the Council, one can hardly imagine what the negative outcome will be in the future at the United Nations, which is composed of sovereign States on an equal footing.

"The financial breakdown of this NGO, as reflected in document E/C.2/2002/R.2, causes suspicion over its financial resources.

"According to information we have, this organization receives annually from the Government 600 billion Won for its operations.

"However, in the application contained in document E/C.2/2002/R.2/Add.2, there is little mention of governmental resources.

"This contradicts Council resolution 1996/31, part I.

"Fourth, my delegation is of the view that given the fact that the application for consultative status of the World League for Freedom and Democracy was withdrawn at earlier sessions of the Committee, granting consultative status to the Korea Freedom League, which is an affiliated member of the above-mentioned NGO, is inappropriate.

"As far as I can remember, the World League for Freedom and Democracy has submitted its application for years since the end of last century, but eventually withdrew its application at the 1999 session of the Committee, the Committee having concluded that its character and activities might not conform to the principles of the United Nations and the Council (see E/1999/109, paras. 6 and 7).

"Therefore, it is preposterous to grant consultative status to the Korea Freedom League, which is affiliated with and pursues the same purpose as the World League for Freedom and Democracy.

"For these reasons, my delegation hopes that this august body of the United Nations will distinguish the real identity of this organization and review its previous recommendation with a view to not granting status to this organization.

"Finally, I request that the present statement be reflected in the official record of the session."

55. The representative of China was of the view that it was important to hear the concerns of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which should be taken into consideration.

56. The representative of Cuba pointed out that the information provided by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was new and relevant,

and emphasized that although it had not been available at the time of the consideration of the application submitted by the organization, the Committee should give proper consideration to that information

57. A number of delegations emphasized that the decision to recommend the granting of consultative status had been taken in plenary session of the Committee, which was open not only to members of the Committee but also to observers. The meetings and the agenda items reviewed in the meeting were published in the daily *Journal* of the United Nations. The Committee's recommendation to grant consultative status to the organization had been taken by consensus.

58. The Chairperson announced that, since the Committee had already taken action on the organization, the recommendation would be presented for adoption to the Council at its forthcoming session. She further indicated that the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea could then, if it wished to do so, submit its concern to the Council. The Committee agreed to proceed in that manner.

2. Requests for reclassification

59. At its 12th and 20th meetings, on 20 and 24 May 2002, the Committee decided to recommend that the Council reclassify three organizations as follows (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (b)):

(a) Centro di Ricerca e Documentazione Febbraio 74: from special to general consultative status;

(b) International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives: from Roster to special consultative status;

(c) International Confederation of Midwives: from the Roster of the specialized agencies to the Roster of the Economic and Social Council.

60. Owing to time constraints, the Committee deferred to its 2002 resumed session the requests for reclassification of the following organizations:

International Council on Mining and Metals

International Sociological Association

Movement for a Better World

Third World Institute

World Safety Organization

IV. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304

A. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31

61. The Committee considered sub-item 5 (b) at its 15th meeting, on 22 May 2002.

Background

62. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the issue of NGOs whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with resolution 1996/31, namely commercial/industrial, professional, religious, research/educational, or government-funded organizations. Several members of the Committee had suggested that a precedent had already been set by granting status to those types of organizations in the past. Further, one member of the Committee had suggested that the granting of consultative status to industry or commercial-based NGOs might cause a further imbalance between the number of NGOs granted consultative status from the North to those granted consultative status from the South since industry/commercial NGOs were not only well financed but also based primarily in the North.

63. At its 2000 resumed session, the Chairman of the Committee had suggested that the Committee take action on the applications, which had been placed in that category for a considerable time. To assist the Committee, it had been recommended that it make use of articles 1, 3 and 8 of Council resolution 1996/31 in its decision-making process. Those articles stipulate that "the organization should be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Council and its subsidiary bodies", that it should "undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities, in accordance with its own aims and purposes and the nature and scope of its competence and activities" and that organizations should be admitted "provided that they can demonstrate that their programme of work is of direct relevance to the aims and purposes of the United Nations".

64. At its 2001 session, the Committee had resumed consideration on that issue and had deferred the applications of the organizations discussed below, which remained in that category for further consideration.

German Advisory Council on Global Change

65. The Committee had deferred the application of the General Advisory Council on Global Change at its 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 sessions on the basis of questions raised regarding its extensive funding from the Government of Germany. One Committee member had expressed the view that an organization could be funded up to 100 per cent by a government as long as that funding was disclosed, as it had been in this case. However, a number of delegations had doubts about the independence of the organization given its membership, which was entirely

composed of representatives appointed by the Government. The representative of Germany had explained, at the above-mentioned sessions, that in his country the government could fund a non-governmental organization and ask for its expertise. He expressed the view that the organization was a commendable one, independent in its decision-making, and could contribute to the Council in a supplementary way.

66. At its 15th meeting, on 22 May 2002, the Committee took note of the request submitted by the NGO to withdraw its application and the Committee therefore decided to close consideration of its application (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (c)).

Syrian Orthodox Church in America

67. The Committee had deferred the application of the Syrian Orthodox Church in America at its 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001 sessions on the grounds that it was not an NGO but a church. At its 15th meeting, on 22 May 2002, the Committee considered the application of the Church. A number of delegations underlined again the fact that it was not an organization but a religious institution. One delegation pointed out that the institution listed a number of churches in its membership.

68. The Committee, taking the view that the organization was a religious institution, decided to close the application of the organization without prejudice (see part one, sect. I, draft decision I, subpara. (c)). The Committee requested the Secretariat to send a letter to the Church explaining its decision and offering suggestions regarding other modalities for interaction with the United Nations.

69. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not consider the applications of the following organizations deferred from its 1998 and 1999 sessions, which remained in that category:

- Southern States Police Benevolent Association
- Working Party "Brussels 1952"

70. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had decided to add to the agenda of its informal working group the issue of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31. However, the group has not yet reviewed the issue.

B. Consideration of issues on the agenda of the informal working group

71. The Committee considered sub-item 5 (c) at its 15th meeting, on 22 May 2002. The Committee discussed various items placed on the agenda of its informal working group for the year 2002, including:

(a) Coordination between the Commission on Human Rights and Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, including guidelines for the submission of special reports and rules and practice concerning the entitlements and obligations of NGOs in consultative status with the Council;

(b) Preparation of a recommendation concerning NGOs whose applications have been deferred for more than two years;

(c) Revised guidelines for quadrennial reports;

(d) Application submitted by organizations affiliated to umbrella organizations that already enjoy consultative status;

(e) Preparation of a recommendation to solve the backlog of applications submitted to the Section;

(f) A revaluation of NGOs on the Roster and a review of the status of NGOs placed on the Roster by virtue of their consultative status with other United Nations bodies or the specialized agencies;

(g) A review of NGOs not in strict conformity with Council resolution 1996/31.

72. At the same meeting, it was decided that Guillermo Reyes, representative of Colombia, would be the facilitator of the working group in 2002. The next meeting of the working group will be held on 8 July 2002.

C. Other matters

73. The Committee considered sub-item 5 (d) at its 16th meeting, on 22 May 2002.

Non-governmental organizations addressing the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session of 2002

74. At its 2nd meeting, on 13 May, the Committee approved the request of the following organizations (see E/C.2/2002/CRP.4) to be heard by the Council during the high-level, coordination and general segments of its substantive session of 2002 (see E/2001/100):

High-level segment

International Trustee Fund of the Tsyolkovsky Moscow State Aviation Technological University

Médecins du monde (International)

Soroptimist International

World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts

World Federation of Democratic Youth

International Scientific and Educational "Znanie" Association

Coordination segment

Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative Relationship with the United Nations

General segment

International Telecommunication Academy

Non-governmental organizations requesting withdrawal of consultative status with the Council

75. At its 16th meeting, on 22 May 2002, the Committee took note of the requests for withdrawal of status submitted by the following organizations and agreed to remove them from the list:

Canadian Chemical Producers' Association

Childhope

International Senior Citizens Association

International Society for Community Development

Soroptimist International of Greece

V. Implementation of Council decision 1996/302

76. The Committee considered agenda item 6 at its 16th meeting, on 22 May 2002. It considered the applications for consultative status of the following two organizations placed on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development (see E/C.2/2002/R.4 and Add.1) (the Committee, in its deliberations proceeded in accordance with Council decision 2001/295, whereby the Council decided that the non-governmental organizations referred to in its decision 1993/220 that wished to expand their participation in other fields of the Council would be considered by the Committee, and that the Committee would do so as expeditiously as possible under an item of its agenda, following the rules and provisions stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31):

Communications Coordination Committee for the United Nations

Environmental Protection Society

77. Since some members of the Committee requested further clarifications, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the two applications, pending their response to questions posed by the Committee.

VI. Review of deferred quadrennial reports

78. The Committee considered item 7 of its agenda at its 13th and 14th meetings, on 21 May 2002. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing a compilation of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and consultative status with the Council on their activities during the period 1994 to 1997, 1995 to 1998 and 1996 to 1999, (E/C.2/2002/CRP.2) which had been deferred from previous sessions of the Committee.

79. The Committee took note of 20 quadrennial reports (see part one, sect. I, draft decision II, subpara. (a)), and deferred consideration of the remaining 19 to its future sessions.

80. The Committee took note of the quadrennial reports of the following organizations:

African Society of International and Comparative Law

Arab Organization for Human Rights

Association of Arab-American University Graduates

Commission for the Defense of Human Rights in Central America

Earthjustice Legal Defense Fund

Friends World Committee for Consultation

International Council for Research and Innovation in Building and Construction

International Electrotechnical Commission

International Federation of Building and Wood Workers

International Motor Vehicle Inspection Committee

Lutheran World Federation

Médecins sans frontières (International)

National Bar Association

National Wildlife Federation

Physicians for Human Rights

Resources for the Future

Union internationale des avocats

Union of Ibero-American Capitals

Women, Law and Development International

World Alliance of Young Men's Christian Associations

Arab Organization for Human Rights

81. While taking note of the quadrennial report of the Arab Organization for Human Rights, the Committee reminded the organization that the concept of a human rights-based approach to development was an issue still under discussion in various United Nations bodies and organs.

82. The quadrennial reports of the following organizations were deferred:

Centrist Democrat International (formerly Christian Democratic International)

Equality Now

France Libertés: Fondation Danielle Mitterrand

International Association for Religious Freedom

International Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists

International Commission of Jurists

International Federation of Human Rights Leagues

International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims

Muslim World League

Pax Christi International

Qatar Charitable Society

Robert F. Kennedy Memorial

Simon Wiesenthal Center

Society For Threatened Peoples

Transnational Radical Party

Women's International Zionist Organization

World Evangelical Alliance (formerly World Evangelical Fellowship)

World Safety Organization

World Society of Victimology

VII. Consideration of special reports and complaints submitted by Member States

83. The Committee considered agenda item 8 at its 10th, 17th and 22nd meetings, on 17, 23 and 29 May 2002. It had before it a number of notes by the Secretary-General transmitting relevant special reports (E/C.2/2000/3; E/C.2/2001/3/Add.1 and Add.2; E/C.2/2002/3).

A. Special reports

Freedom House

84. At its 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a complaint by the delegation of China against Freedom House on the grounds that the organization had improperly obtained interpretation services for a panel discussion held during the 56th session of the Commission on Human Rights. The organization had been requested to present a special report on its activities to the Committee at its June 2000 session.

85. At its resumed 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a special report and a response from Freedom House explaining the incident. The Committee had deferred consideration of the complaint to its 2000 resumed session, pending the receipt of a response to questions posed by the Committee members regarding the work of the organization. The Chairman of the Committee had also been requested to address a letter to the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, requesting a report on the outcome of the inquiry carried out by the United Nations Office at Geneva on the incident concerning the issue of interpretation.

86. At its resumed 2001 session, the Committee had had before it a response from the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, a response from the organization to the questions posed by the Committee and a letter from the organization concerning the incident. Several delegations had stated that they were not convinced by the responses provided by the organization and had posed additional questions. The Committee had decided to defer the matter pending receipt

of a special report on the role and activities undertaken by the organization in Cuba and clarification of questions posed by Committee members.

87. At its 17th meeting, on 23 May 2002, the representative of Cuba expressed her delegation's dissatisfaction with the special report submitted by Freedom House and its replies to questions posed at the Committee's resumed 2001 session on the ground that the report contained misstatements about the NGO's activities in Cuba and failed to address the question concerning the criteria used to designate and accredit representatives to the subsidiary bodies of the Council, while the responses to Member's written questions had given rise to the need for further clarification. Moreover, the NGO had committed further violations of its status at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The representative of Cuba made the following statement:

> "At the session in January my delegation requested more time to consider the special report submitted by Freedom House. As our distinguished colleagues will recall, the organization was requested to present a special report about its activities carried out in relation to Cuba, particularly its activities inside the country involving sending individuals of various nationalities, mainly from Eastern European countries, to carry out specific missions on Cuban national territory. The organization was also requested to describe the criteria and procedures followed to designate and accredit its representatives to the meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the Council.
>
> "My delegation has analysed the special report by Freedom House and wishes to state that we are not at all satisfied. First, the report does not include the information requested on the accreditation of its representatives. Second, the document contains information and, in particular, statements by the organization which are contradictory and entirely untruthful.
>
> "The Committee now also has the organization's replies to the questions it was asked by several delegations during the January session. My delegation has examined them carefully and, as in the case of the special report, we are not satisfied, for the reasons explained above.
>
> "Far from helping to dispel the serious concerns raised by some members of this Committee, both documents only increase the doubts, questions and queries about the nature of the organization and its activities, bearing in mind the lack of truth in the statements made by the organization in both the report and the replies.
>
> "It is very easy to refute the organization. Not only because Cuba has presented more than enough arguments to demonstrate its politically motivated activities and hypocrisy and show that it has the essence, characteristics and status of an agency dependent on and subordinate to the United States Government. But also because even official United States government sources openly contradict and expose the true nature of what Freedom House states and reasserts in the documents submitted to the Committee. Many of the arguments put forward by Cuba are based on information from these official sources and on statements by the very individuals whom the organization recruits to carry out its anti-Cuban activities.
>
> "Just to mention one example: in its special report, Freedom House states that it has never sought to create organizations or cells, or attempted to recruit

or initiate individuals into opposition activity. Also, in its answers to the Committee's questions, the organization insists that it is Freedom House, and only Freedom House, that decides in which countries to implement its programmes and the goals of those programmes, including the Cuban programme. It is only necessary to look at the recently published (May 2002) Cuba program of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to confirm unequivocally that the organization is lying shamelessly to the members of this Committee.

"Freedom House is one of the organizations financed by USAID as part of its Cuba program. In this program, USAID not only allocates specific funds to the organization, but also tells it exactly how it should use this financing. The alleged Freedom House programme in Cuba, entitled "Cuba Democracy Project" is in no way one of the organization's initiatives, but forms an integral part of the USAID Cuba program, and the goals of this project are also established by USAID and not by Freedom House. One of these goals is specifically to promote the formation of a political and civil leadership in Cuba by establishing links between various organizations inside the country.

"Consequently, the organization's allegation that only Freedom House determines its programmes and their goals is not true; nor is it true that the organization has never tried to establish groups and recruit individuals to carry out its subversive activities in our country. The document distributed (USAID Cuba Program) shows clearly that Freedom House is an instrument paid by the United States Government to execute the activities that the latter assigns it.

"In this context, I must also refer to the most recent incident related to the issue of accreditation.

"As will be recalled, at the 2000 session, the Cuban delegation submitted to the Committee a complaint about the accreditation as a member of the Freedom House delegation at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights of a representative of the so-called Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Friedrich Hayek, whose request for consultative status had been rejected by this Committee barely two months earlier, when proof was given of its ties to terrorist organizations.

"At the following session of the Committee, in 2001, Cuba once again complained, denouncing the serious violations committed by the organization during the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights, when it accredited among its representatives, Mr. Jesús Permuy and Mr. Miguel Loredo, both of Cuban origin, who work for terrorist organizations based in Miami.

"My delegation would now like to refer to the irregularities that took place during the recently concluded fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, as a result of the stratagems used by Freedom House for accreditation of these individuals.

"Both men were included initially on the list of Freedom House representatives to the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights. However, they were accredited by United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation. When this organization discovered Mr. Permuy's and Mr. Loredo's background, it withdrew their accreditation, giving conclusive evidence of respect for the good practice that non-governmental organizations

in consultative status with the Council should observe. Then, the two men were accredited immediately by Freedom House. Subsequently, using various ploys, Freedom House managed to persuade another non-governmental organization, Interfaith International, to accredit them. The latter, also respecting good practice, sent a letter of apology to Cuba, explaining that the representative of Freedom House had asked it to accredit these individuals, because Freedom House was withdrawing from the Commission.

"If both men were initially on the list of Freedom House representatives, why were they accredited by another organization that did not even know them?

"What did Freedom House do to make another non-governmental organization accredit them?

"What arguments did Freedom House use to accredit them through another non-governmental organization and what were its objectives?

"How does the organization explain that, once United Towns had withdrawn the accreditation from these individuals, Freedom House again accredited them as part of its delegation?

"Why did both men appear shortly thereafter accredited by a third non-governmental organization, which later presented its apologies about this to Cuba?

"The conduct and activities of this organization show a clear pattern of violations of resolution 1996/31. Not only is it far from being a non-governmental organization, since it is essentially an agency of a Government, which finances it and gives it orders and tasks to perform, not only is it an organization that carries out activities that are evidently politically motivated, but it is also an organization that unscrupulously manipulates and violates the established norms on accreditation of representatives to meetings of Council bodies.

"This behaviour by Freedom House can only be described as disgraceful.

"The Cuban delegation wishes to reiterate its concern about such violations and demands a detailed explanation of the situation, which creates a very bad precedent within a body that has already encountered frequent problems in the area of accreditation.

"Specifically, my delegation wishes to request the organization to submit a supplementary special report giving the information omitted from its previous report on the criteria and procedures that it follows when accrediting its representatives. The new report should also include a detailed explanation of the incidents that occurred at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, which we have just described. At the same time, my delegation will transmit further questions for the organization to the Secretariat in writing, and would like to have the replies in writing also."

88. The representative of the United States stated that his delegation had once again thoroughly examined the special report submitted by Freedom House and was fully satisfied with the responses the NGO had given. He pointed out that Freedom House had been under review since 2000 and that the Committee had put questions to the NGO on five different occasions, on each of which his delegation had

expressed its satisfaction with the responses given by the NGO, which the United States regarded as a well respected and internationally known organization whose work should be welcome within the United Nations.

89. In the light of those facts, the delegation of the United States invoked rule 50 of the rules of procedure of the Council and called for a no-action motion, which would adjourn the debate on the item under discussion, i.e., the special report by Freedom House. On a point of order, some Committee members expressed surprise at the motion to discontinue the review of Freedom House. Following a statement of the representative of Cuba, the Committee suspended the meeting by a roll-call vote of 8 to 7, with 2 abstentions. The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Sudan.

Against:

Chile, Colombia, France, Germany, Romania, Turkey, United States of America.

Abstentions:

India, Tunisia.

90. Upon the resumption of the meeting, the motion of no action requested by the delegation of the United States was supported by the delegations of France and Germany. The representatives of Cuba and China made statements against the no-action motion. The representative of Cuba mentioned that her delegation had further questions concerning the special report submitted by Freedom House, the organization's responses to questions posed at the Committee's resumed 2001 session and an incident that had occurred at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights. The representative of Cuba also asserted that as long as questions remained outstanding delegations had the right to resolve their doubts, and that the Committee should respect the letter and the spirit of Council resolution 1996/31 in that regard.

91. The representative of Cuba made the following statement:

> "My delegation totally opposes the proposal made by the United States delegation to adjourn the debate on the special report by Freedom House.
>
> "Historically, it has been this Committee's practice to devote all the time necessary to reviewing an organization while Member States still have any doubts, questions and concerns about the organization in question. The rigour, the effectiveness and, above all, the credibility of our work depend precisely on our ability to review each case thoroughly in order to adopt the appropriate decisions. Furthermore, as established in Council resolution 1996/31 and as has been the practice of this Committee, Member States have a legitimate right to request non-governmental organizations to provide them with any additional information, answers and clarifications they may require.
>
> "As has been said repeatedly, Freedom House is an organization which has been the subject of intense questions from several delegations, members and non-members of the Committee, owing not only to its lack of independence, since it is an agency of the United States Government, but also because it carries out politically motivated activities against certain States, particularly Cuba, as has been demonstrated with very concrete arguments.

"The concerns and accusations regarding Freedom House are very serious. My delegation has submitted evidence proving that the organization is lying in both its special report and its answers to the Committee. My delegation has even presented new elements that show the stratagems and ploys used by Freedom House with regard to accreditation at the recently concluded fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, and has requested a supplementary report on these irregularities.

"We know that several other delegations also have concerns and questions they wish to ask the organization.

"In these circumstances, imposing the adjournment of the discussion on the Freedom House report constitutes a gross violation of the standard practice of this Committee and its norms and procedures, adversely affecting the legitimate right of Member States to request additional information and clarifications and ask the questions they consider pertinent."

92. After the statement of Cuba, the representative of Senegal also expressed support of the United States motion. The representative of China noted that there were many questions that needed clarification and expressed regret at the departure from the customary democratic practice and transparent approach of the Committee.

93. Subsequently, in accordance with rule 50, the Committee decided to adjourn the debate on the special report of Freedom House by a roll-call vote of 10 to 5, with 3 abstentions (see part one, sect. I, draft decision II, subpara. (b)). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Algeria, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, France, Germany, Romania, Senegal, Turkey, United States of America.

Against:

China, Cuba, Lebanon, Russian Federation, Sudan.

Abstentions:

Ethiopia, India, Tunisia.

94. After the vote, the representative of Algeria stated that he had misunderstood the vote and his vote should have been counted as an abstention. The representative of Pakistan noted that had he been present he would have voted against the motion.

95. Explanation of votes after the vote were made by the representatives of the Sudan, Cuba, China, Lebanon, Germany, Chile and France.

96. The representative of Chile explained that his delegation had voted in favour of the motion because the replies of the NGO had been completely satisfactory in the past three or four sessions of the NGO Committee, and because although the work of Freedom House might be discomfiting for some Governments, it was, nevertheless, independent and in line with Council resolution 1996/31.

97. Several delegations expressed regret that the Committee had adopted a motion which did not allow members to ask more questions, noting that they had been expecting to hear from the representative of the organization, who was present in the room. One delegation, noting that there was a difference between harassment and dialogue, expressed the opinion that the procedure of adjourning the debate of an item did not comply with the spirit of the Committee and did not guarantee the right

of NGOs to justify their positions and the right of every delegation to seek clarification from and conduct dialogue with any NGO.

98. The delegation of France expressed its satisfaction with the result of the vote, which had shown the support of the Committee in favour of a well-known NGO with a long history in the cause of human rights. France also recalled that Eleanor Roosevelt was among those who had contributed to the establishment of the NGO.

99. Two delegations objected to the criticism that the motion to adjourn discussion of the item in question contravened the Committee's standard practice, claiming that a similar situation had occurred in the consideration of the International Lesbian and Gay Organization (ILGA) at the Committee's resumed 2001 session, when some members had had further questions concerning the organization. Several other delegations rejected the comparison on the grounds that the cases of ILGA and Freedom House were very different since ILGA had had time to clarify its position because the vote was taken only after the representative of the organization had had the opportunity to address the Committee; furthermore, the vote at that time had been taken on a request to give more time and not to raise subsequent questions. The representative of Lebanon added that in the case of ILGA, the burden of proof of its detachment from paedophilia weighed on the organization itself since that was why it had been expelled, and it had failed to provide that proof even after several such opportunities were given to it. Some delegations were of the opinion that the case of Freedom House necessitated that certain contradictory responses be clarified.

100. The representative of Sudan noted that in its statement at the Committee's resumed 2001 session, Freedom House had referred to visiting the Sudan in connection with producing a report on that country. However, when asked for details about that visit, the NGO had responded that no representative or delegation from Freedom House had visited Sudan "per se", but that the organization had conducted a dialogue with representatives of government officials in New York and Geneva. The delegation of Sudan stated that those responses were astonishing and misleading to the Committee, and should have been further clarified since the organization was declaring on the one hand that it had visited the country and on the other hand had contradicted itself by denying what it had already declared. The representative of Sudan stated that the organization, by contradicting its own answers and being continuously and seriously misinformed about a Member State of the United Nations, had put its credibility and integrity in serious doubt. The delegation of the Sudan reserved its right to raise further questions concerning the organization while following its activities closely.

101. The representative of Cuba made the following statement:

> "My delegation would like to reiterate its strongest opposition to the decision that has just been imposed to adjourn consideration of the special report by Freedom House, thereby disregarding the right of delegations to resolve their doubts and receive answers to their questions and concerns.
>
> "Forcing adjournment of a case when several delegations still have doubts, questions and serious concerns runs counter to good practice and the norms and procedures that this Committee has always observed. What has happened in the case of Freedom House today sets a bad precedent for the future work of the Committee, and, in addition to being unfortunate, can only be considered embarrassing.

"Freedom House has demonstrated a consistent pattern of violations of resolution 1996/31, thereby tarnishing the excellent work and the real and important contributions of the NGO community to the work of the United Nations.

"Cuba urges the organization to observe and respect the provisions of resolution 1996/31.

"The Cuban delegation wishes to put on record that it will continue to monitor closely the role, conduct and activities of Freedom House and will take the necessary action if the organization abuses its consultative status. Cuba also reserves the right to submit a new complaint in the future on the incidents that occurred at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights with regard to accreditation, and to ask the organization further questions at such time as it deems appropriate."

102. The representatives of the Sudan and Cuba, in their statement in response to the intervention by the delegation of Chile, stated that their wish to clarify the issue in question was not about Governments being made uncomfortable by an NGO but about the organization disseminating misleading information about Member States and failing to observe the rules governing NGOs in consultative status and their relationship with the United Nations. At the request of the Committee to clarify the consequences of the adoption of the motion under rule 50 of the rules of procedure, namely the adjournment of debate on the item under discussion, the Secretary stated that any further consideration of the file of the special report of the NGO currently under review had thus been adjourned, i.e., the Committee might not consider it further. However, the members had the right to pursue the discussion on the issue of Freedom House in the future.

United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation

103. At its 2000 session, the Committee had requested the organization to submit a special report on its activities to the Committee at its resumed 2000 session. In particular, the Committee had requested information on the activities undertaken between the NGO and the International Council of the Associations for Peace in the Continents (ASOPAZCO).

104. At its resumed 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a special report submitted by the organization and a letter submitting additional information responding to the questions posed by the delegation of Cuba on the special report circulated among Committee members. The latter delegation had also asked for more time to consider the report and had requested that the organization respond in writing to questions raised on the relationship between the NGO and ASOPAZCO. The Committee had decided to defer consideration of the special report of the NGO pending receipt of a written response from the organization to the questions raised by the delegation of Cuba.

105. At the 2001 session of the Committee, the delegation of Cuba had stated that in view of the reorientation of the organization's leadership, more time was needed to consider its status. The Committee had decided to defer the consideration of the matter to its 2002 session.

106. At its 17th meeting, on 23 May 2002, the Committee considered the special report of the NGO. Recalling that her delegation had initiated the review of the

NGO and had closely followed the organization's activities since then, the representative of Cuba expressed complete satisfaction with the reply and the answers contained in its report, especially its responsible behaviour when the NGO had learned that two individuals that it had accredited to the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights had been accused of having terrorist affiliations. Noting that their names had been mentioned before in the Committee, the representative of Cuba distributed the letter from the NGO withdrawing accreditation from Jesús Permuy and Miguel A. Loredo, stating that such a response should go on record as an example to be followed of good practices and willingness to respect and comply with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31.

107. In accordance with the proposal of the delegation of Cuba, the Committee decided to close the case of the complaint against the NGO (see part one, sect. I, draft decision II, subpara. (c)).

International Federation of Human Rights Leagues

Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples

New Human Rights

Women's Human Rights International Association

108. At its resumed 2001 session, the Committee had had before it special reports submitted by five non-governmental organizations in response to a complaint by the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The organizations had been charged with having accredited a terrorist organization, the Modjahedin Khalgh Organization/ National Council of Resistance (MKO/NCR) to the fifty-seventh session of the Commission on Human Rights.

109. The charges against one of the five organizations had been dropped following an apology from the NGO. The special reports by the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues and Women's Human Rights International Association had been deferred pending further consideration by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples and New Human Rights had been asked to prepare additional special reports on the issue of the presence of MKO/NCR at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission and at the Third Committee of the General Assembly. The reports, which were also to contain a clear statement that the organizations would not accredit members of terrorist organizations in the future, were to be submitted to the Committee at its 2002 session.

110. At its 9th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the Committee reviewed the special reports submitted by the four above-mentioned organizations (see E/C.2/2001/3/Add.2 and E/C.2/2002/3). The reports of the International Federation of Human Rights Leagues and Women's Human Rights International Association were found acceptable by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the Committee decided to close the complaint on those two organizations (see part one, sect. I, draft decision II, subpara. (c)). The report from New Human Rights was found acceptable insofar as it accepted responsibility and apologized for having provided MKO/NCR with accreditation; however, New Human Rights had failed to add the requested declaration of good faith. It was found that the report of the Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples

was not acceptable and that the organization had also failed to attach the requested declaration of good faith.

111. The Committee decided to request that New Human Rights submit a declaration clearly acknowledging and apologizing for the error of judgement in using its privilege to accredit MKO/NCR, and giving a firm assurance that it would not give such assistance in the future to that organization or any other with known terrorist affiliations or agenda contrary to the territorial integrity or security of member States. The same signed declaration was requested from the Movement against Racism and for Friendship among Peoples, as well as an additional special report specifically addressing the incident that had given rise to the complaint and clearly indicating that the organization understood and took responsibility for its violation of its consultative status.

112. At its 22nd meeting, on 29 May 2002, the Committee considered the signed declaration submitted by New Human Rights and, having approved the statements therein, decided to close the complaint on that organization (see part one, sect. I, draft decision II, subpara. (c)).

France Libertés-Fondation Danielle Mitterrand

113. At its resumed 2001 session, the Committee had before it the response from France Libertés-Fondation Danielle Mitterrand to questions posed by the Committee on the organization's quadrennial report that had been reviewed earlier in the session. The delegation of China, concerned that the report contained unfounded allegations regarding China's relationship with Tibet and questioned the territorial integrity of China, requested that the organization provide a special report on its position regarding China's sovereignty over Tibet. Further consideration of the organization's quadrennial report was deferred pending receipt of the requested special report.

114. At its 22nd meeting, on 29 May 2002, the Committee had before it the special report submitted by France Libertés-Fondation Danielle Mitterrand. The representative of China made the following statement:

> "After carefully reviewing the special report of France Libertés-Fondation Danielle Mitterrand on the question of Tibet, the Chinese delegation would like to make the following comments.
>
> "First, to respect the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries is a major principle of the United Nations Charter and the basic requirement of Council resolution 1996/31 concerning NGOs in consultative status. However, the report totally disregarded the fact that Tibet is Chinese territory and claimed that China "invaded and occupied" Tibet. This has grossly infringed upon the Charter and represents an open challenge and contempt for China's sovereignty and territorial integrity. It has also severely violated the regulations stipulated in article 2 of Council resolution 1996/31 concerning the behaviour of NGOs in consultative status with the Council.
>
> "Second, to quote in the report the so-called resolutions of the General Assembly has entirely ulterior motives. As known to all, the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly on the question of Tibet were a product of the cold war. Those resolutions, adopted by vote in the absence of the resumption of China's legitimate seat in the United Nations, represented

interference in China's internal affairs. The Chinese Government has thus never recognized them. Up till now, all Governments of the countries throughout the world have recognized that Tibet is an inalienable part of China's territory. Nevertheless, the report turned a blind eye on this basic fact by clinging to a cold war mentality and advocating 'the independence of Tibet'. Its vicious intention of interfering in China's internal affairs should be guarded against.

"Third, as known to all, a brutal and dark feudal serfdom existed in Tibet for centuries, under which there was simply no human rights in Tibet to speak of. Since that feudal serfdom was abolished and democratic reform was introduced in Tibet in the 1950s, human rights in Tibet have genuinely improved and been promoted. This report totally disregarded the above-mentioned fact and unwarrantedly accused the Chinese Government of violating human rights in Tibet. We cannot help asking whether the purpose of this organization is to protect the human rights or to maintain feudal serfdom in Tibet?

"The Chinese Government has all along attached importance to the role of NGOs and encouraged all NGOs that abide by the principles and purposes of the Charter to participate in relevant United Nations work. This conforms with not only the basic principle of the Charter but also the basic spirit enshrined in Council resolution 1996/31 and the norms governing the work of the Committee. However, we firmly oppose those NGOs that advocate the separation of the country.

"For the reasons stated above, the Chinese delegation has flatly rejected the special report and has thus put forward the following proposals:

"1. The Chairperson of the Committee should send to the organization a letter stating that the special report of the organization has been refused, reminding it to respect the Charter and to act in strict accordance with Council resolution 1996/31, and calling on the organization to correct its erroneous position on Tibet; otherwise, the Committee would consider suspending or withdrawing its consultative status.

"2. The organization should be requested to submit to the Committee at its resumed 2002 session an additional special report.

"3. Until the additional special report is submitted to the Committee, the Committee should defer the consideration of its quadrennial report."

115. Several delegations took the floor to acknowledge the sensitivity and seriousness of the issue, which concerned the basic principles of territorial integrity and national sovereignty espoused in the Charter, and to express their support for the requests made by the delegation of China to address the matter.

116. Following the debate, the Committee decided to request the NGO to submit a supplementary special report on the matter for the Committee's consideration at its resumed 2002 session, to be held in January 2003, in which the organization was invited to further clarify its previous positions on Tibet. It was also decided that further consideration of the quadrennial report submitted by the NGO would be deferred.

B. Complaints by States

117. At its 2002 session, the Committee had before it the following documentation: three new complaints submitted by the Permanent Missions of Viet Nam, Sri Lanka and Turkey to the United Nations; correspondence from Ambassador Krysztof Jakubowski, Chairman of the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, drawing attention to complaints concerning NGO representatives accredited to the session submitted by the Permanent Missions of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Viet Nam and Colombia to the United Nations, and, in accordance with the mechanism identified by the Committee's working group on NGO accreditation, transmitting the full exchange of correspondence between the concerned member States and the Chairman or the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights. The Committee also had before it a number of notes by the Secretary-General transmitting special reports deferred from the 2001 resumed session.

Transnational Radical Party

118. At its 10th meeting, on 17 May 2002, the Deputy-Permanent Representative of Viet Nam informed the Committee that the Government of Viet Nam had lodged a complaint, through its Permanent Mission to the United Nations, against the Transnational Radical Party for providing accreditation to the Montagnard Foundation (MFI), which had allowed a representative to speak at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights.

119. The representative of Viet Nam stated that MFI was a terrorist group and an arm of a larger terrorist organization, the Front unifié pour la liberation de races opprimées (FULRO), an armed organization created during the war in Viet Nam against the people of Viet Nam. MFI had openly acknowledged that it was an arm of FULRO in an announcement distributed in Geneva.

120. The representative of Viet Nam further stated that after the reunification of the country in 1975, FULRO had staged sabotage and terrorist activities, causing heavy casualties among Vietnamese civilians, and that all the terrorist activities of MFI and FULRO served the declared aim of creating "an independent state of Degar" in the central highlands of Viet Nam. He asserted that that action would undermine the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Viet Nam, a multi-ethnic nation with more than 54 ethnic groups and a Member State of the United Nations.

121. The representative of Viet Nam urged the Committee to take measures to prevent MFI from being accredited in the name of the Transnational Radical Party to meetings of the Economic and Social Council or any other meeting of the United Nations. He insisted that the Transnational Radical Party put an end to this abuse of its consultative status, and requested that the organization be made to explain its breach of the consultative guidelines in a special report on the incident.

122. In support of the request for a special report from the Transnational Radical Party, the representative of China stated that his delegation had encountered similar problems with the Transnational Radical Party at sessions of the Commission on Human Rights, when the NGO had allowed people to speak on its behalf in order to make unfounded accusations against China.

123. The representative of Cuba observed that this was not the first time that an incident of that nature had occurred in the context of meetings of the Commission on Human Rights. She noted that the number of such incidents was rising, as were complaints from member States. The representative of Cuba suggested that special attention be accorded to the issue either within the Committee's working group or in the framework of the session of the Commission itself. The representative went on to note that in the light of the fact that the name of the NGO in question suggested a political party, her delegation would like to know more about its activities, which information could also be included in the organization's special report. Moreover, the delegation of Cuba would like the special report to describe the procedures or criteria used by the organization in selecting representatives to participate in the various subsidiary bodies of the Council.

124. The representative of Pakistan recalled that the Committee's informal working group on accreditation had taken up the issue of NGOs in consultative status providing a platform for individuals and groups who would otherwise not have been accredited to United Nations-sponsored meetings. He also recalled that the working group had addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Commission on Human Rights strongly recommending that all NGOs be briefed appropriately beforehand and made to understand that they would be held responsible for their accredited representatives and any activities or utterances that violated Council resolution 1996/31. Deploring the fact that despite those measures complaints were still being presented by Member States, the representative of Pakistan proposed that another clear message be sent from the Committee to the NGOs involved in such practices, and suggested that the issue be discussed further in the working group established by the Committee.

125. The representative of the Russian Federation pointed out that the Russian delegation had on numerous occasions called the attention of the Committee to the activities of the NGO, and requested that the special report include additional clarifications on the motives at the basis of its activities within United Nations bodies.

126. In the light of the general support of the request of the delegation from Viet Nam, the Committee decided to request that the Transnational Radical Party prepare a special report on its activities and the incident that had given rise to the complaint by the delegation of Viet Nam, for submission to the Committee at its resumed 2002 session.

Asian Legal Resource Centre

International Peace Bureau

127. The complaint brought by Sri Lanka stated that NGOs accredited by the Asian Legal Resource Centre had circulated documents from an organization called the Asian Human Rights Commission which contained politically motivated and unsubstantiated allegations against Sri Lanka. The complaint went on to note that since the Commission did not enjoy consultative status with the Council the distribution of documents from an entity that neither had consultative status nor was a recognized national institution constituted a violation of NGO guidelines.

128. With regard to the Tamil Centre for Human Rights, the complaint pointed out that the organization had been denied NGO consultative status by the Council.

Nevertheless, its Secretary-General had been accredited by the International Peace Bureau to the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, where that individual had distributed books and pamphlets in the name of the Centre. Furthermore, the Centre's representative had addressed the Commission on behalf of the International Peace Bureau and made politically motivated and unsubstantiated allegations against Sri Lanka. Attention was drawn to the fact that the above incident was not the first instance of violation by the Tamil Centre for Human Rights. Similar violations had occurred in 2001 at the fifty-seventh session of the Commission, and representations had been made to the secretariat of the Commission by the Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations Office at Geneva.

129. The complaint from Sri Lanka pointed out that the actions described not only violated the guidelines on NGO participation in the Commission on Human Rights but were also detrimental to the endeavours currently under way to arrive at a peaceful settlement of the armed conflict in Sri Lanka through dialogue. Accordingly, the Committee was asked to give due attention to the violations committed by the Asian Legal Resource Centre and the Tamil Centre for Human Rights in Geneva, and to take appropriate action to prevent NGOs from committing further abuses of the guidelines pertaining to participation of NGOs in the work of the Commission on Human Rights. It was recalled that the Permanent Representative of Sri Lanka to the United Nations in New York had addressed the Committee at its 2001 session and urged that it request the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat to provide advice on what the Secretariat could do to investigate the identity and background of NGO representatives at Commission sessions and to prevent, in appropriate cases, their participation. The report of the Committee, (E/2001/86), had in fact recorded the Committee's decision to discuss the matter further under all its aspects in its informal working group, including the question of seeking legal advice as proposed by the Ambassador of Sri Lanka.

130. With regard to possible measures for the Committee to address the problem of NGO accreditation to and participation in the work of the Commission on Human Rights, the Chair of the Committee recalled that in a similar case in the previous year, the Committee had drafted in the informal working group a set of criteria to be followed by NGOs in their interaction with the Council, which had then been sent to organizations that had drawn complaints. The Chair proposed that the same procedure be followed again. Some delegates raised the question of the efficacy of the proposed measure, bearing in mind the trend of repeat violations by the same organizations and also taking into consideration the fact that guidelines coming from an informal working group might lack the necessary authority. In response to those concerns, it was noted that the organizations cited by the delegation of Sri Lanka were not the same organizations charged previously. It was further noted that although the working group was of an informal nature, once a proposal had been approved by the Committee it became an official act.

131. It was therefore decided that the Committee would build on its previous experience and an admonitory letter from the Chair, together with the guidelines approved by the Committee at its resumed session, would be sent as a reminder to the NGOs concerned.

International League for the Rights and Liberation of Peoples

132. The representative of the Government of Turkey deplored the fact that, at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights, the International League for the Rights and Liberation of Peoples had distributed a document entitled "Civil and political rights, including the question of freedom of statement" (see E/CN.4/2002/NGO/30), which contained unfounded allegations against Turkey and disregarded the territorial integrity of that country by describing a region referred to as "Pontos" as a separate entity from Turkey. A complaint had been issued through the Geneva Office of the secretariat of the Commission, requesting the withdrawal of the aforementioned document and an explanation of the incident from the organization in question. Since it had received no responsive action from the said NGO, the Government of Turkey had brought the issue before the Committee. The delegation of Turkey expressed its hope that the Committee would take action to prevent the NGO from repeating such behaviour in the Commission and elsewhere in the United Nations.

133. The representative of Turkey emphasized that his delegation did not wish to increase the workload of the Committee by asking for a special report at this stage, but rather to ask through the Committee for a written explanation from the NGO. Several delegations supported the request and it was therefore decided that a letter would be sent to the International League for the Rights and Liberation of Peoples, asking for a full written explanation of the incident at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights. Upon receipt of a reply from the NGO, the Committee would return to the issue.

Complaint brought by Colombia

134. The representative of Colombia brought to the attention of the Committee a regrettable incident that had occurred on 18 April 2002 at the fifty-eighth session of the Commission on Human Rights during the intervention made by Gustavo Bell Lemus, Vice-President of Colombia. The representative of Colombia informed the Committee that the individual who was responsible for this disruption had been accredited by an NGO holding consultative status with the Council. The individual in question was prevented from attacking the Vice-President and was denied further access to meetings. However, bearing in mind the security risks posed by such an incident, the Government of Colombia requested that the NGO responsible for providing accreditation be officially identified by the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights with a view to asking the organization to submit a full report on the incident in question as well as details of the procedure and criteria used for accreditation and the chain of responsibility for making decisions regarding accreditation.

135. The Committee decided to address a letter to the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights requesting the information sought by the Government of Colombia, and decided that it would revisit to the issue upon receipt of that information.

VIII. Organization of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

136. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations held its 2002 session from 13 to 24 May and on 29 and 30 May 2002. The Committee held 24 meetings (1st to 24th).

B. Attendance

137. The session was attended by the 19 members of the Committee. Observers for other States Members of the United Nations, representatives of organizations of the United Nations system and observers for non-governmental organizations also attended. One organization, having received a standing invitation to participate as an observer in the session and the work of the General Assembly, was represented by an observer. The list of participants is contained in annex II.

C. Election of officers

138. At its 1st meeting, on 13 May, the Committee elected the following officers by acclamation:

Chairperson:
Mihaela Blajan (Romania)

Vice-Chairpersons:
Guillermo Reyes (Colombia)
Philipp Ackermann (Germany)
Ishtiaq H. Andrabi (Pakistan)

139. At its 4th meeting, on 14 May, the Committee also elected by acclamation Ali Cherif (Tunisia) to serve as Vice-Chairperson, and Ishtiaq H. Andrabi (Pakistan) to serve as Rapporteur, in addition to Vice-Chairperson.

D. Agenda

140. At its 1st meeting, on 13 May, the Committee adopted the provisional agenda for its 2002 session as contained in document E/C.2/2002/1. The agenda was as follows:

1. Election of officers.
2. Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters.
3. Strengthening of the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Secretariat.
4. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations:

(a) Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the previous session of the Committee;

(b) New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification.

5. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304:

(a) Process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations;

(b) Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31;

(c) Consideration of issues in the agenda of the informal working group;

(d) Other related matters.

6. Implementation of Council decision 1996/302.

7. Review of deferred quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special consultative status with the Council.

8. Consideration of special reports.

9. Provisional agenda and documentation for the 2003 session of the Committee.

10. Adoption of the report of the Committee.

141. At the same meeting, the Committee approved its organization of work as contained in an informal paper.

E. Resumed 2002 session

142. At its 24th meeting, on 30 May 2002, the Chairperson introduced a draft decision authorizing a resumed 2002 session of the Committee from 8 to 24 January 2003. The Secretary of the Committee read out a statement regarding the conference-servicing implications of the draft decision (see annex I). Following statements by the representatives of China and the Sudan, the Committee adopted the draft decision (see part one, sect. I, draft decision III).

143. Following the adoption of the draft decision, the representative of the United States expressed the concern of his delegation regarding the budgetary implications of the resumed 2002 session of the Committee, and stated that the Secretariat should not present the resumed session of the Committee as being outside current budgetary provisions. The Committee had held resumed sessions for years and that expense should have been anticipated in the budget.

F. Documentation

144. The list of documents before the Committee at its 2002 session is contained in annex II.

IX. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its 2002 session

145. At its 24th meeting, on 30 May 2002, following statements made by the representatives of Germany, India, France, the Sudan, Colombia and the United States, the Committee adopted the draft report on its 2002 session as contained in document E/C.2/2002/L.1 and an informal paper (see part one, sect. I, draft decision V), and authorized the Rapporteur to finalize the report, in consultation with the members of the Committee, as appropriate.

Annex I

Conference-servicing implications of convening of a resumed session of the Committee in January 2003

1. The present statement has been prepared in accordance with rule 28 of the rules of procedures of the Economic and Social Council.

2. Under the terms of draft decision III (see part I, sect. I), the Economic and Social Council would decide to authorize the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to hold a resumed session for a period of two weeks and three days from 8 to 24 January 2003 in order to complete the work of its 2002 session.

3. The proposal would entail the provision of 26 meetings (two meetings per day), with full interpretation services. There would be 120 pages of pre-session, 10 pages of in-session and 50 pages of post-session documentation in six languages.

4. The convening of a resumed session for a period of two weeks and three days in January 2003 would entail additional conference-servicing requirements over and above current budgetary provisions. Those requirements are estimated at $433,300 at full cost. It would not be possible to absorb those additional requirements within the appropriation approved for the 2002-2003 biennium. Consequently, should the Council adopt the draft decision, an additional appropriation would be required under sections 2 ($414,200) and 27 D ($19,100) of the programme budget for the 2002-2003 biennium.

Annex II

List of participants

Members

Algeria	Abdelouahab Osmane, Farida Bakalem
Bolivia	Viviana Limpias Chávez
Chile	Loreto Leyton, Carla Serazzi
China	Bohua Xie, Meifang Zhang, Xiaomei Li
Colombia	
Cuba	H. Bruno Rodriguez, Orlando Requeijo Gual, Ricardo Tur Novo, Maria del Carmen Herrera Caseiro, Luis A. Amoros
Ethiopia	Birhanemeskel Abebe, Lulit Zeqdie Mariam
France	
Germany	Philipp Ackermann, Volker Pellet, Eva Eckert
India	A. Gopinathan, B. S. Bishnol, Ruchira Kamboj, A.V.S. Ramesh Chandra
Lebanon	Sami Zeidan
Pakistan	Ishtiaq H. Andrabi, Imran Ahmed Siddique
Romania	Mihaela Blajan, Livia Rusu
Russian Federation	Andrey A. Nikiforov, Vladimir A. Vertogradov, Dmitriy V. Knyazhinskly
Senegal	Mankeur Ndiaye
Sudan	Elfatih Erwa, Siddig Mohamed Abdalla, Ilham Ibrahim Mohamed Ahmed, Tarig Ali Bakhit
Tunisia	Ali Cherif
Turkey	Levent Bilman, Sevki Mutevellioglu, Hakan Tekin
United States	Sichan Siv, John Davison, Richard Williams, Ruth Wagoner, Peggy Kerry

States Members of the United Nations represented by observers

Canada, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Guatemala, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Jordan, Netherlands, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Ukraine, Viet Nam

Non-member States represented by observers

Holy See

Entities having received a standing invitation to participate as observers and maintaining permanent observer missions at Headquarters

Palestine

Specialized agencies and related organizations

World Health Organization, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

Annex III

List of documents

Document symbol	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
E/C.2/2002/1	2	Annotated provisional agenda
E/C.2/2002/3 E/C.2/2001/3 and Add.1 and 2 E/C.2/2000/3	8	Notes by the Secretary-General transmitting special reports
E/C.2/2002/R.2 and Add.1-5	4 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting new applications for consultative status
E/C.2/2002/R.3	4 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting new requests for reclassification
E/C.2/2002/R.4 and Add.1	6	Memorandum by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Council decision 2001/295
E/C.2/2002/CRP.1	4 (a)	Compilation of applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions of the Committee held in 1998, 1999, 2000 and 2001
E/C.2/2002/CRP.2	7	Compilation of quadrennial reports deferred from previous sessions of the Committee held in 1999, 2000 and 2001
E/C.2/2002/CRP.3	4 (a)	Compilation of requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions of the Committee
E/C.2/2002/CRP.4	2	Requests by non-governmental organizations to be heard by the Economic and Social Council
E/C.2/2002/CRP.8	5 (b)	Compilation of applications for consultative status by non-governmental organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31